



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/799,455	03/12/2004	Sean E. Purcell	MS308121.1/MSFTP644US	7697
27195 7590 04/25/2008 AMIN. TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP 24TH FLOOR, NATIONAL CITY CENTER 1900 EAST NINTH STREET CLEVELAND, OH 44114			EXAMINER MAI, KEVIN S	
			ART UNIT 2152	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 04/25/2008	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docket1@thepatentattorneys.com  
hholmes@thepatentattorneys.com  
osteuball@thepatentattorneys.com

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/799,455	<b>Applicant(s)</b> PURCELL ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> KEVIN S. MAI	<b>Art Unit</b> 2152	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) KEVIN S. MAI.

(3) Kieth Drabek (no. 60757).

(2) Philip Lee.

(4) \_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 21 April 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 11, 22, 34 and 40.

Identification of prior art discussed: Rajan 2005/0165895, Daniell 2005/0097174, and Adjaoute 2003/0009495.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant proposed amendments for claims 1, 11, 22, 34 and 40. Applicant made arguments as to why applicant's invention is not entirely taught by Daniell. The major argument being that the applicant's invention discloses blocking only a portion (less than the whole) of an e-mail while Daniell did not. Based on the proposed amendments further search and reconsideration are still required.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Philip C Lee/  
Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2152

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required